

Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/662,812		CHOI, YANG-IIM	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Trang Doan		2131	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Trang Doan.

(3) David J. Cutitta (Reg. No. 52790).

(2) Syed Zia.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 08 November 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Cato.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed the subject matter of the invention regarding the the specification. Applicant further pointed out within claim 1 that Cato did not teach the feature including transmitting the selected metadata fragment data and the metadata-related information with data format information indicating a type of the selected metadata fragment data. Based on the interview recently filed arguments, Examiner agreed that Cato does not teach the described features. However, no further analysis/search will be made until the formal written response is received. No agreement was reached at this time for allowance .